

REMARKS

The drawings have been objected to as being difficult to view. A complete set of replacement formal drawings is submitted herewith. Applicants believe that this submission overcomes the Examiner's objection. If it does not, further clarification is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 has been amended to clarify that the razor blades are left devoid, over the extents between their first and second longitudinal ends, of connections between adjacent razor blades so that adjacent said razor blades are secured only at said first and second longitudinal ends. This is a minor clarifying amendment which is believed to put the claims in better condition for appeal, and thus Applicants respectfully request that it be entered after final. Claims 27-31 have been cancelled without prejudice to reduce the issues for appeal.

Claims 16-21 and 23-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, and second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. The Examiner states that "the limitation requiring 'leaving said razor blades...devoid of connections so that adjacent said razor blades remain unconnected to each other' is not understood. Applicant's blades have multiple welds between the ends and are connected to one another." The only "multiple welds" between the ends of the blades are the multiple spot welds 32 that connect the cutting member 26 of each razor blade to its respective blade support 30 -- these welds do not connect adjacent blades. The adjacent blades are connected only at their ends, as is clear, for example, from Fig. 9, which shows the fixture used to connect the blades, and the language of original claim 1. While not conceding that claim 16 is indefinite, Applicants have amended claim 16 to recite "leaving said razor blades over said extents between said first and second longitudinal ends devoid of connections between adjacent razor blades so that adjacent said razor blades are secured only at said first and second longitudinal ends." Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn in view of this amendment and the remarks above.

Claims 16-21, 23, 24, 26-28 and 30 have been rejected as anticipated by Gooding, claims 20 and 23 have been rejected as obvious over Gooding, and claims 21 and 31 have been rejected as obvious over Gooding in view of Shurland. Applicants believe that the explanation above

should also overcome these rejections. Gooding clearly does not "leav[e] said razor blades over said extents between said first and second longitudinal ends devoid of connections between adjacent razor blades so that adjacent said razor blades are secured only at said first and second longitudinal ends" as claimed. Instead, Gooding secures the adjacent blades to each other at several locations between their longitudinal ends, using five corrugated webs 11c (see col. 2, lines 16-24). Shurland does not supply a teaching or suggestion of this feature of Applicants' claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

It is believed that no fees are due with this submission. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 00216-621001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 12, 2006

/Celia H. Leber/
Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906